

In recent years, some progress has been made in nuclear weapons reduction and security; and in April, Russia finally ratified the START II agreement. But many other problems remain. Among them is Russia's decision to build nuclear reactors in Iran and transfer missile technology to that country.

In this context, the recent revelations that the U.S. and Russia had entered into a secret agreement to allow Moscow to continue arms to Iran are especially troubling. It would appear that the Clinton-Gore administration, in its relations with Russia, chose to abandon the principles of progressive diplomacy established at the beginning of the century by Woodrow Wilson in his demand for open covenants, openly arrived at.

The still secret Gore-Chernomyrdin agreement not only flouted law, but also failed to safeguard our national interest and security. In what amounted to an inverted arms-for-hostage deal, U.S. policy was, in effect, taken hostage by a Russian arms strategy designed to destabilize the Middle East.

The agreement's apparent purpose was to facilitate a Russian aid policy that resulted in the squandering of American tax dollars for the benefit of a kleptocratic elite, rather than the Russian people.

The legitimization of Russian arms sales in defiance of law is hardly in the interest of a safer world. The naivete of this approach is matched only by the perfidiousness of its execution.

From an American perspective, it would appear that one of the purposes of the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission may have been to burnish the Vice President's foreign policy credentials and make his management of U.S.-Russia relations a centerpiece of his potential campaign themes.

It is now self-evident that U.S. policy failed, and the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission is a symbol of that failure.

The question is how the U.S. and the next Administration should proceed from here. Though isolationism is always at issue in our democracy, the American tradition is dominated by pragmatic and compassionate internationalism. Most Americans recognize that what happened in Russia, still a nuclear superpower with a seat on the UN Security Council, is profoundly important to our national security. A peaceful and democratic Russia remains a compelling U.S. interest. Consistent with the strong humanitarian strain in our foreign policy, Americans maintain an interest in helping the Russian people achieve a market economy based on the rule of law.

America need not turn its back on the international financial institutions, but it has an obligation to see that taxpayer resources are not squandered, nor used to enrich the few at the expense of the many. Americans should continue to be prepared to support genuine Russian efforts to help themselves. Here, it must be understood that Russia's economy will remain hapless unless the Russian government begins to deal effectively with corruption and takes the necessary steps to establish an intermediary financial system that services a saving public, instead of a thieving elite.

No nation-state can prosper if it lacks a place where people can save their money with confidence and seek lending assistance with security. Russia, which is the land mass most similar to our own, has been kept back for most of this century by the Big "C" of Communism and is now being kept back by the little "c" of corruption—which may prove more difficult to root out than Communism was to overthrow.

What the Russian people—and those of so many developing countries—deserve is a chance to practice free market economics under, not above, the rule of law. If attention is paid, above all, to establishing honest, competitive institutions of governance and finance, virtually everything else will fall into place.

Unfortunately, over the past six or eight years the basics of law and economics have been ignored for the sake of the politics of expediency and neither the national interest of America nor Russia has been advanced by a mis-targeted and mismanaged aid program.

It is time that the symbiotic statecraft symbolized in the Gore-Chernomyrdin relationship that has legitimized and ensconced crony capitalism in Russia be brought to a halt. It is time for the American people to insist that their leaders concern themselves with the plight of the Russian people rather than the well being of a new class of kleptocrats.

□

IT IS TIME TO PUT PEOPLE BEFORE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago I asked a question on the House floor as to the schedule because it seems to me that there is some confusion. We have been asked now vis-a-vis the Senate to have a potential 14-day CR.

Now, to refresh the memory of those listening, we were asked by the President to stay and work day in and day out 24-hour CRs until we get our work done, and we have done that. We have tried to work. We have tried to negotiate. Now it appears that sometime within the last 12 hours, Mr. DASCHLE, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and Mr. Podesta, the President's chief of staff, had a meeting and decided to take a 14-day CR over to the Senate and place it on TRENT LOTT's desk and ask for unanimous consent, and apparently the Senate has taken them up on their offer for a 14-day CR because the politics of confusion is not working for them.

Many of the Members on my side of the aisle, including one of our most vulnerable members, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), remained in Washington, D.C. to do the people's business because he believes more in the sanctity of the voting process here than going home to protect his reelection. The courage that he has displayed will ensure his reelection, because he truly represents his district.

Unlike some of the Democratic House leaders featured today in the Hill Magazine, Wednesday, November 1 edition,

and let me read the headline because it is telling. Last night I heard the chants, work, work, work from the minority side of the aisle; gets everybody festered up, ready to do the people's business. Let me read this because it is telling. Democratic House leaders miss weekend votes. Despite President Clinton's pledge to stay here with you and fight for the legislative priorities, not one House Democratic leader was present last weekend for all 7 votes taken on session-ending procedural matters.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), all missed votes while we worked trying to solve some very, very difficult issues. Some are on immigration. We have heard a blanket amnesty requested by the President, and I am all for letting people stay in America that have been tortured and oppressed from their homelands, but let us get the record straight. We do not want to just give everybody amnesty until we figure out who they are, why they are here, what their backgrounds are, do they have criminal records.

Every time they talk about blanket amnesty, people in Haiti and Cuba and other places decide maybe it is worth risking their life to come on a raft to the United States, because if they just reach our shores they will be allowed to stay because some day a future Congress will blanket amnesty them as well.

So those that go legitimately to the INS process 2 and 3 years at a time, waiting for some response that they may be citizens, are basically shunned and turned away because they do not and are not covered by blanket amnesty.

Now the Republican majority has proven itself capable of staying here in town working until the job is done. We were blamed for the shutdown of government. I remembered some on the other side howling about shutting down the government; it is the Republicans' fault. The Chamber is empty today and the Republicans are talking, I being one, and am prepared to stay through Tuesday, election day, to make certain we deliver a budget that is good for America, good for kids and schools, good for Medicare recipients, good for hospitals.

We have delivered that bill and we have delivered tax relief, and we have done so in a prudent, sensible, cost-effective manner; but we are tied up on a couple of issues and they are refusing to budge. The President is in California, Kentucky, New York, except, excuse me, let me flash back, stay here with you, said the President, until our job is done. Well, he is in New York with his wife campaigning. He will not sign a bill helping women with cervical and breast cancer. He will not do a White House ceremony because it may involve the gentleman from New York

(Mr. LAZIO) and that would give him unfair publicity in a very tough Senatorial contest.

Seemed like the White House had no problems finding a picture of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) and Mr. Arafat at a common reception when a delegation went to visit Israel and Palestine and areas of that nature in order to talk to the people to bring about peace. They can find a photo, but they cannot make time for a bill signing.

Mr. Speaker, one other critical matter coming before the Congress, and I can assure you it will get done, and that is the Everglades. Thanks to the Speaker today and others who have urged our leadership to move forward on the Everglades, we are going to see a bill before this session of Congress ends, not in lame duck but in this session, before Friday. If the other Members of the minority think it is too important to go home and campaign, well how about it, because you are missing anyway.

We are going to stay here and make certain the principles of the democracy are upheld, that we fight the good fight on behalf of our constituents. Our constituents are as important as theirs are, but I urge every Member to stop the rhetoric and nastiness and aspersions and start focusing on why we are here.

I think we have made some tremendous successes, and I compliment the other side of the aisle on a number of them but I suggest that in this day and era we need goodwill, not a poisonous atmosphere. It is time to put people before politics.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that it is not in order in debate to characterize Senate action or, except as provided in rule XVII, to refer to Senators.

□

ARMY DIVISIONS WERE DECREASED, NOT INCREASED, UNDER DEMOCRAT ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we have some very serious issues on the table during this national campaign, one that involves truly all the Members of the House of Representatives, many members of the Senate and, of course, the Presidential candidates. In the last debate between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush, Vice President GORE said that he had increased a number of Army divisions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the American people to know that is not the case. When the Clinton-Gore administration took over in January of 1993, we had 14 Army divisions.

□ 1630

Today, we only have 10. So under President or Vice President GORE's leadership, along with that of President Clinton, we have actually cut the Army to 10 divisions; we have not increased it. So somewhere along the line he inadvertently invented four U.S. Army divisions.

Mr. Speaker, along with slashing the size of the Army, this administration has, I think, cut the Navy to 316 ships from 546 ships. That is a cut of almost 40 percent. They have cut the Air Force from 24 active fighter airwings to only 13. It is time to rebuild national security.

The interesting thing about these massive cuts in force structure, meaning we have about 60 percent of the military that we had when this administration took over, is that generally speaking, one would expect, when we cut a sports organization or we cut a business organization, we would think that when we cut it down in size, the half that one has left, if one cuts it in half, is going to be better prepared, better equipped and better trained than the big operation that one had earlier. That core should be a good, highly-efficient, highly-prepared operating core, whether it is in sports or in business or in the military world.

Well, the sad thing about this cut in our military force structure, cutting the Army from 18 to 10 division, cutting our fighter airwings from 24 to 13, and cutting our Navy from 546 ships to only 316 ships, the tragedy is, the small military we have today after these slashes is not as prepared as the big military that we had during Desert Storm. The chief of staff of the Army has told us that we are now some \$3 billion short on ammunition for the Army. The Marine Corps has told us that they are \$200 million short on ammunition. The Air Force chief of staff has told us that we are roughly 50 percent short on precision munitions. Those are the munitions that we have, where instead of carpet-bombing a bridge, one can fly in and put one precision munition, very, very accurate, on one strut of that bridge and knock the bridge down. It is a highly-efficient way to project American power.

So the Air Force told us they have cut those munitions down to the point where they only have 50 percent of what they need. The Navy has informed us that they only have 50 percent of their requirement for Tomahawk cruise missiles. Those cruise missiles are what we use to go into an area that is heavily defended, where if we send pilots in to drop bombs out of planes, we might lose some of those pilots. So those cruise missiles, those Tomahawks are very valuable; but today we only have 50 percent, according to the Navy, of what we need.

Now, along with that, we see the mission capability rate of our frontline fighter aircraft just dropping off the cliff. Mission capability rate is how many of our aircraft work. If I ask my

neighbor, what is your mission capability rate of your cars and he said, a minute and I will tell you, and he went outside and he tried to start them, and he had two cars and only one started, he would come back in and say, it is 50 percent, only one of the two cars starts.

Well, the mission capability rate for our frontline fighters, the F-15E and the F-16, has dropped into the 70 percent rate. That means that it has dropped about 10 points from the 83 percent-or-so mission capability rate to an average of about 72, 73 percent. That means out of 100 aircraft, 30 of them cannot get off the ground and cannot go do their job. So now there is this shortage of fighter airwings, these 13 fighter airwings we have, are only about 70 percent ready to go. That means we really only have about nine airwings that really are ready to go out and engage the enemy.

So Mr. GORE has not presided over a resurrection of the U.S. military; he has presided over a decline.

Mr. Speaker, I think that help is on the way.

□

BREAST CANCER DRUGS: INTERNATIONAL PRICE COMPARISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by now, most Americans are aware that prescription drug prices are higher in the United States than any other industrialized country; 2, 3, even 4 times higher. It is difficult to believe that drug manufacturers manipulate prices even when a drug is used to treat a life-threatening illness like cancer. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the drug makers are doing.

A study I released yesterday looks at the prices charged for drugs used to treat breast cancer. Mr. Speaker, 8,600 women in Ohio will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year; and 1,900 will die from this disease. In the counties I serve as a Congressman, women with breast cancer pay 2½ times more for the 5 most commonly used breast cancer drugs than women in Canada pay, in France pay, in England pay and in Italy pay. Tamoxifen, the most widely used cancer drug, has the highest-priced differential. A monthly supply of Tamoxifen costs an uninsured woman in my district \$114. In Canada, it costs \$12; in France, it costs \$10.20. We are talking about price differentials in the 850 percent to 1,000 percent range. It is unbelievable and it is unconscionable. A woman diagnosed with breast cancer needs to devote all of her energy to fighting that cancer. The toughest battle should be surviving the cancer, not finding ways to pay for medications. Prescription drug prices are priced unreasonably, unjustifiably, and outrageously high in the United States.